

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. In view of the foregoing amendments and following comments, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims pending in the application is respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant respectfully notes that the Examiner has not returned signed and initialed PTO form 1449 for the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed October 14, 2003. Applicant requests the Examiner to acknowledge consideration of the references submitted in the Information Disclosure Statements.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 12, 14-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Lazaridis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,464) in view of Wong (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,288). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the following basis.

Independent claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended to essentially recite that the electronic message is configured to appear in a format that corresponds to a user interface for an application that resides on a terminal associated with a recipient of the electronic message, among other things. Independent claim 14 has been amended to recite the electronic message is configured to appear in a format that corresponds to a user interface for an application that resides on the sending terminal, among other things. At least these features are not taught or suggested by Lazaridis et al. and Wong.

In an exemplary embodiment, the scripting agent processes the message received from the user via the wireless terminal device before sending such a message to one or more intended recipients (see Specification Page 9, Lines 15-17). For example, to present the recipient with the appearance of the message having originated from a first terminal device utilizing a standard e-mail application, the scripting agent

processes the informational message received from the wireless terminal device and formats the message in accordance with an e-mail application, such as Lotus Notes™ (see Specification Page 9, Lines 18-21). For instance, the message may be presented having separate fields for sender, copy line, recipient, brief description of subject matter of the message, date and time, body of the text of the message, etc (see Specification Page 9, Line 21-Page 10, Line 1).

The Examiner acknowledges that Lazaridis et al. does not disclose that the electronic message is configured to appear as if originating from an application associated with a recipient (or sending—In claim 14) terminal and relies on Wong to teach these features (see Office Action of November 7, 2003 Page 2, Paragraph 2; Page 3, third full Paragraph; and Page 5, first Paragraph). Wong is directed to a system and method for performing call signaling for multimedia call setups (see Wong, Abstract). Wong discloses encapsulating call setup requests in a common format to make the signaling protocol independent, because different telephony and communication networks use different signaling protocols (see Wong, col. 2, lines 15-18). The Called Agent identifies the current terminal associated with the called party by looking up the relevant record in the user profile (see Wong, col. 24, lines 63-65). The Called Agent then presents the call to the current terminal using the native call setup (see Wong, col. 24, line 67-col. 25, line 2). The Called Agent determines whether the preferred medium matches that of the current terminal type (see Wong, col. 25, lines 6-8). Applicant respectfully submits that Wong discloses using the appropriate protocols for a call setup between two particular terminals according to the terminal types and does not address electronic messages configured to appear in a format that corresponds to a user interface for an application that resides on a recipient (or sending—In claim 14) terminal.

Regarding claims 1, 8, and 15, Lazaridis et al. and Wong are deficient, both alone and in combination, because at a minimum, they fail to disclose or suggest the electronic message is configured to appear in a format that corresponds to a user interface for an application that resides on a terminal associated with a recipient of the

electronic message. Likewise for independent claim 14, Applicant respectfully submits that Lazaridis et al. and Wong are deficient, both alone and in combination, because they fail to disclose or suggest the electronic message is configured to appear in a format that corresponds to a user interface for an application that resides on the sending terminal.

Claims 4, 6, 11, 13, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lazaridis et al. and Wong and in further view of Woltz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,216,165). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the following basis.

The Examiner acknowledges that Lazaridis et al. and Wong "do not disclose transmitting the electronic message (all or summary messages) to the wireless terminal device after the passage of a predetermined amount of time during which the electronic message has not been opened at the first terminal device" and relies on Woltz et al. to teach this feature (see Office Action of November 7, 2003 Page 5, Paragraph number 3). Woltz et al. discloses generating different e-mail message formats to enable compatibility with various pager types (see col. 4, lines 16-29). Even if Woltz et al. discloses transmitting the electronic message (all or summary messages) to the wireless terminal device after a passage of a predetermined amount of time during which the electronic message has not been opened at the first terminal device, Lazaridis et al., Wong, and Woltz et al., both alone and in combination, remain deficient, because they fail to disclose or suggest the electronic message is configured to appear in a format that corresponds to a user interface for an application that resides on a terminal associated with a recipient of the electronic message.

In view of the foregoing differences between claims 1, 8, and 15, and the cited prior art, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness based on Lazaridis et al., Wong, and further in view of Woltz et al. Thus, claims 1, 8, and 15, are believed to be allowable over these references and claims 2-7, 9-13, and 16-20 are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency. Thus, reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.


Customer Number
29315

Application Serial No.: 09/481,511
Attorney Docket No.: 23452-087
Reply and Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: February 9, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sean L. Ingram', is written over a horizontal line.

Customer Number
29315

Sean L. Ingram

Registration No.: 48,283

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND
POPEO P.C.

12010 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 900

Reston, Virginia 20190

703-464-4806